

Section M - Evaluation Factors For Award

FAR Source	Title and Date
52.217-5	Evaluation of Options (Jul 1990)

M.1 Evaluation of Options

- (a) The Government will evaluate offers for award purposes by adding the total price for all options to the total price for the basic requirement. Evaluation of options will not obligate the Government to exercise the options. Offers containing any charges for failure to exercise any option will be rejected.
- (b) Selection of an offer will be made on the basis of the most advantageous alternative to the Government provided that the contract prices reasonably represent the value of bona fide requirements for each fiscal year. This determination with respect to contract prices will be made after evaluation of such factors as commercial or catalog prices for short-term leases, system startup expenses, multiyear price protection, assured system life availability of equipment, software and vendor support. If a determination is made that an offeror does not meet these criteria, that offer cannot be accepted for award.

M.2 Evaluation of Proposals

This section is intended to explain the rationale and precise criteria by which proposals resulting from this solicitation will be evaluated. Offerors are advised that they are not restricted as to what is presented in their proposals, as long as sufficient material is provided to allow evaluation of specific proposal elements defined in Section M.3 which follows.

M.3 Proposal Evaluation Criteria

Proposals will be evaluated on the following bases. The criteria identified in the following paragraphs are keyed to the proposal preparation instructions contained in Section L.

A proposal that has no weaknesses and no particular strengths above and beyond meeting the basic requirements defined in the RFP for a particular evaluation criteria element, will receive less than the full credit available on that element. To achieve the full credit for an element, the proposal must go well beyond the requirement by offering exceptionally innovative or particularly well thought out or insightful methods, procedures, solutions or new opportunities for major improvements.

Part I - Technical Proposal Evaluation

Criterion 1 - Understanding of Work

This criterion will be scored on the degree to which the offeror demonstrates an understanding of CDC's mission/programmatic needs for information technology solutions.

Criterion 2 - Proposed Resources and Approach

This criterion will be scored on the strength of the proposed resources and approach that the offeror will commit to the contract to address the requirements.

Criterion 3 - Past Performance and Performance Metrics

This criterion will be scored on the degree of relevancy and success in past performance efforts of a similar scope, size, complexity, and subject matter in accordance with the RFP. Performance measures will be evaluated on the degree of quality, success, and risk found in these measures.

Criterion 4 - FAR Part 19 Adherence

This criterion will be scored on the strength of any subcontracting relationships, the presence of a strong overall management structure, and the attainment of subcontracting goals. Specifically:

1. Offerors who have restrictive subcontract agreements as evidenced in the subcontract documents received with the technical proposal so that subcontractors are restricted in any way from pursuing other opportunities at CDC, will receive lower evaluations than those offerors who do not.
2. Offerors who conduct competitive procurements and who do not require exclusive subcontract agreements, pre-award, will receive a higher evaluation than those offerors who require pre-award exclusive agreements, as evidenced by the subcontract documents received with the technical proposal.
3. Offerors who propose SDB firms in compliance with FAR Part 19 for the Small Disadvantaged Business Participation Plan will receive more credit than those offerors who do not. The quality and cost effectiveness of the plan will be evaluated and be a determining factor as to what credit is given. In addition, offerors who include HUBZone subcontracting opportunities will receive more credit than offerors who do not. The quality and cost effectiveness of the HUBZone participation plan will be a determining factor as to how much credit is given. Offerors who propose firms in compliance with FAR Part 19 who bring recognized expertise in specific advanced technologies or hard to find skills will result in a higher score than those who propose subcontractors not having recognized information technology expertise in the skills required in this RFP.
4. Strategic alliance information will be evaluated on the quality of the alliance, i.e., the strength of the relationship, how long the alliance has existed, and how closely the strategic alliance aligns itself with the scope of work articulated in this RFP.
5. The management of subcontracts will be evaluated as to how strong and effective the processes are which offerors put into place to insure quality, timely, and cost effective subcontractor performance.
6. This sub-factor will be evaluated and effectiveness determined by the cost efficiencies proposed for using Temporary Help firms to fill vacancies and how well and to what degree offerors have integrated the use of Temporary Help firms into their recruiting strategies.

Criterion 5 - Key Personnel Resumes

This criterion will be scored on the strength of the key personnel proposed both individually and collectively.

Criterion 6 - Oral Presentations

Point assignment for evaluation of the above criteria is as follows:

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Points</u>
Understanding of Work	150
Proposed Resources and Approach	150
Past Performance and Performance Metrics	300
FAR Part19 Adherence	200
Key Personnel Resumes	100
Oral Presentations	100
TOTAL	1000

Part II - Cost Proposal Evaluation

The offeror’s cost data will be evaluated to analyze and assess the accuracy and reasonableness of the proposed cost, the realism of the proposed cost, and probable cost to the Government. The cost proposal will also be used to develop an assessment of risk to the government in making the award; i.e., as an aid to CDC in determining the offeror’s understanding of the work requirements, assess the validity of the offeror’s approach to performing the work, and assess the offeror’s professional employee compensation plan and ability to provide high quality uninterrupted work. Risk will be assessed as low, moderate and high. The government will not make an award to a low estimated cost offeror with a high risk assessment nor will the government make an award to a high estimated cost offeror with a low risk assessment without substantial technical benefit as identified through a cost-technical trade off as defined in M.4 below.

M.4 Relationship Between Cost or Price and Technical Strength

Offerors are advised that in the evaluation process technical proposals and cost or price will be of approximately equal importance.

This RFP will result in a “best value” source selection. Best value means that the Government will perform a cost/technical trade-off analysis such that business judgement will be exercised in selecting the most advantageous alternative to the Government, considering both the technical merit and costs of proposals. The determination of best value will be made by comparing the differences in the value of performance capability factors with the differences in the costs proposed. The Government will not make an award at a significantly higher overall cost to the Government to achieve only slightly superior performance capability features. The Government will make this assessment through the development of trade-off analyses and other analytic studies that involve the assessment of benefits of superior performance capability features - for example, economic benefits clearly attributable to increased productivity; probability of successful contract performance; unique and innovative approaches or capabilities - versus added costs. Overall cost to the Government may become the ultimate determining factor for award of the contract as proposals become more equal based on the other factors. The degree of equality between offerors’ proposals will be measured by the quantity, significance, and applicability of the superior features proposed and not by the total scores achieved.

Cost/price realism and cost risk/probable cost to the Government are of significant importance in the overall contract award decision. Therefore, offerors are reminded that award will be made to that offeror whose proposal provides the combination of features that offers the greatest overall value to the Government.

The cost and business portion of offerors’ proposals will not be assigned quantitative scores. The information contained in the Cost/Price Proposals will be analyzed and evaluated to determine validity,

realism and reasonableness of each cost proposed, and to assist in determining the cost risk and most probable cost to the Government, including options to extend the period of performance of the contract. The evaluation will include an assessment of the cost of doing business with each offeror and predicted growth in the proposed costs during the course of the contracted effort. The purpose of this cost realism analysis will be to determine if:

- (a) The offeror's proposed costs are realistic for the work to be performed;
- (b) The proposed costs demonstrate that the offeror understands the Government's requirements; and
- (c) The proposed costs are consistent with the various elements contained in the technical proposal and other portions of offeror's business proposal.

Based upon this cost realism analysis, an assessment will be made of the most probable cost to the Government when awarding the contract to a particular Offeror.